



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 10, 1995

No. 110

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. EVERETT].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 10, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable TERRY EVERETT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority and minority leaders, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

COMPACT-IMPACT AID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again call attention to an issue which combines all of the worst elements of a failed Federal policy in immigration which has resulted in huge unfunded mandates and stands as an example of how to make and break a promise. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of the Federal Government's failure to compensate the people of Guam for expenses incurred as a result of a treaty we on Guam had no part in shaping.

Mr. Speaker, do Members of this body or the citizens of this country know that there are countries in this world, independent nations which have free and unrestricted access to the United States?

Mr. Speaker, do Members of this body or the citizens of this country know that there are nationals of other countries who can walk through immigration checkpoints with only an identification card; with no visa requirement, with no passport, with no restriction on their movement or time of stay?

Mr. Speaker, do Members of this body or the citizens of this country know that there are citizens of other countries who can come into the United States and work, receive public assistance and other benefits available to citizens and permanent residents apparently without restrictions?

It is true that citizens of the newly independent countries of the former Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, under a treaty relationship between their countries and the United States, can come and have come to the United States, primarily to the State of Hawaii and the Territory of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas. And many have come to work and be productive participants in the economy.

But there is the matter of the Federal Government making a commitment to unrestricted access by foreign nationals via a treaty which falls disproportionately on local governments like that of Guam. This is not new to many areas of the country where a similar situation has resulted in "unfunded mandates." Bear in mind that this is legal immigration with no restrictions—no paperwork and no documentation, and all that is required for entry is an identification card from their own country—not even Canada, which has open borders with the United

States, has such favorable immigration treatment.

This is a serious enough situation, but in the case of Guam—it is far more egregious in its negative impact because of our small size and limited population. And in terms of the issue of the unfunded mandates, the commitment was not made verbally or through exchanges of letters by the Federal Government—it was authorized in statute passed by this body in Public Law 99-239.

Public Law 99-239, section 104(e)(6) states:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, such sums as may be necessary to cover the costs, if any, incurred by the State of Hawaii, the territories of Guam and American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands resulting from any increased demands placed on educational and social services by immigrants from the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia.

We call this reimbursement compact-impact-aid—the assistance due local governments for the financial impact of the Compact of Free Association. Guam, due to its proximity, has received the greatest share of this immigration. Since the treaties went into effect, we now estimate that 6 percent of the total population of Guam is from these freely associated states. If the same percentage of immigrants were applied to the United States, there would be 15 million immigrants. And what is more startling is that this unrestricted immigration is entirely legal.

The total cost to the Government of Guam since the inception of this immigration is in excess of \$70 million. The Guam Memorial Hospital estimates an impact of \$750,000 in costs in fiscal year 1994, and \$2.55 million since 1986 to the Medically Indigent Program due to compact immigrants. Public housing assistance cost Guam \$2 million in fiscal year 1994 and \$7.5 million since 1986.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H6701

I have also heard reports from one elementary school principal who must devote three classrooms, with teachers and aides, just to teach English and reading skills to immigrants.

The total reimbursement given to Guam based on the law has been \$2.5 million.

This is all that has been given to Guam in reimbursement for this dramatic impact on our society and economy. Mr. Speaker, given this legacy of the Federal Government's inability to make good on its promises, we should ask the question, What is Guam asking for in the Interior appropriations and what is Guam getting in the Interior appropriations?

These are easy questions. Guam is asking only that the Federal Government start living up to its commitment by putting in \$4.58 million that the administration requested for fiscal year 1996. Guam is not asking for Government assistance; Guam is not asking for special projects; Guam is only asking for a down payment of a long overdue bill.

And what is Guam getting? Well, the answer is simple. Currently, the Interior budget is giving Guam zero, zilch, zip, nothing, nada, tayá—no money, however you want to say it. It is time to begin paying the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this week I intend to offer an amendment to H.R. 1977, the Interior appropriations bill, to restore the funding requested by the administration for the cost of this immigration. The Federal Government cannot have a free ride at Guam's expense, on a policy Guam had no part in shaping. The Federal Government cannot open Guam to unrestricted immigration and then stick us with the bill. The Federal Government cannot pass on this unfunded mandate to Guam while leaving us alone to deal with the impact of this immigration. I urge my colleagues to support Guam's compact-impact reimbursement.

COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, today is the first day that the American citizens start working for themselves. What do I mean by that:

Yesterday was the Cost of Government Day. The American people worked from January 1 of this year to July 9 of this year for the government. I say to my colleagues, "If you add up all the taxes paid on the local, State, and Federal level, and the cost of regulation, 52 cents out of every hard-earned dollar that the American people earn goes to the government. Out of the 365 days in the calendar year, the American people worked 189.9 days for the government and the regulatory bureaucracy. They worked 15.3 days for defense, 13½ days for interest on the

national debt, 28.7 days for Social Security and Medicare, 51.1 days for State and local taxes and regulations, 41.7 days for Federal regulations, and 35.6 days for other Federal programs."

I ask my colleagues, "Did you know that more than half of the money that you earn goes to the government? Actually 52 cents of every dollar, every dollar earned by the average worker, is spent on government, tax and regulations? This means that you spend more time working for the government than you do for yourself and your family. It means that only 48 cents out of every dollar earned by the American family is available to pay for housing, food, education, transportation, and other essentials."

Mr. Speaker, this is unconscionable and immoral. By recognizing government-imposed costs and regulations, we can begin to increase public awareness of the 52-cent swindle.

As chairman of Cost of Government Day I say to my colleagues, "I urge you to join me in highlighting the cost of government to the average American family by giving a 1-minute or participating in the press conferences to come, and I urge all my colleagues to do so."

True, this year, the total cost of government is estimated to be \$3.3 trillion. Nearly \$1 trillion of this is the result of regulation. The Federal Government alone is responsible for \$720 billion in hidden taxes through regulation this year. That amount equals \$2,800 for every man, woman, and child in America.

Although the burden is immense, it can be lessened quickly. If the House Republican budget proposal were to be implemented, the Cost of Government Day would be 17 days earlier by the year 2002. That would allow Americans to work 2½ weeks longer for themselves and their families. Regulatory and legal reforms could move the Cost of Government Day to even earlier.

Mr. Speaker, we need these budget, legal, and regulatory reforms in order to reduce the Government's negative impact on the American family.

Mr. Speaker, July 9 marks the third annual Cost of Government Day. Cost of Government Day is an excellent opportunity to drive home the need for less government spending and more regulatory reform. The 104th Congress has made an excellent start. Passage and implementation of the House Republican budget will make Cost of Government Day come much quicker and the American family be able to spend more of its hard-earned dollars for things they think are important rather than for what some bureaucrat thinks is important.

Mr. Speaker, over in the other body they are starting the debate on regulatory reform, and the first thing out of the box for the last week has been an absolute unheralded attack on Members of Congress that are trying to bring some good science and common sense to regulations in this country.

We have been attacked with the notion that we are destroying the environment, that we are removing safety. Indeed people are attacking us for even costing lives. What we are talking about is bringing reasonableness to regulations.

Let me just go over a couple of these issues that show how crazy and extreme the regulatory environment in this country has gotten. In Sacramento, CA, residents are reeling over a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ruling last fall which added three varieties of fairy shrimp to the endangered species list. The agency relied on a one-paragraph petition submitted by a Davis, CA, botanist in 1990 even though millions of hardy shrimp can be found in California, Europe, Asia, Australia, and Africa. The decision has shut down a pony ranch that housed a Sacramento program for the needy and disabled children and could cost the Sacramento area housing industry \$500 million.

That is the kind of regulation that we are trying to stop. That is the kind of regulation that we are trying to bring reasonableness to. That is the kind of regulation that we are trying to bring forward, regulatory reform to bring forward, to stop the cost. That is a direct cost to the American people, thereby a direct cost to the American family.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is really sad that yesterday was the Cost of Government Day, that the American family has to work more than half the year for the government. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we need to put policies forward in this country that lessen the number of days that the American family has to work for their Government and increase the number of days that the American family can work for themselves.

GLOSSING OVER THE ROUGH SPOTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, when credible and respected observer organizations, notably the International Republican Institute, returned from the June 25 elections in Haiti to report their documented observations—both the good and the bad—they were not received with open arms. It was more like a shoot-the-messenger situation here and elsewhere in Washington because at that time international organizations, the Clinton administration officials, and some of the national media even were too busy painting rosy pictures of what was going on in Haiti—glossing over widespread irregularities in the elections that actually happened hailing the relatively non-violent atmosphere on election day as the measure of a successful electoral